

The

# Philanthropist.

VOLUME VI. NO. 46.

CINCINNATI, WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1842.

WHOLE NO. 300

From the *Emancipator and Free American*.  
VIRGINIA—THE WAR PROSPECT—A  
PROTEST.

We have before adverted to the internal division existing in Virginia, in consequence of the irregularity of representation between the Eastern and Western divisions. By the constitution as amended in the convention of 1820, at the dictation of Randolph, Leigh, Tyler, Upshur, and other slaveholders of the old counties, it was established that the representatives should be divided between the districts lying East and West of the Blue Ridge, in the proportion of 78 to the Eastern and 56 to the Western division. And the only way to alter the apportionment was by a vote of two-thirds of each branch of the Legislature in the year 1841, and at intervals of ten years thereafter. Well, the laws of trade and the laws of nature, mock at the arrogance even of the slaveholder and Virginians.—The lapse of a single ten years has brought about so great a change, that, by the late census, the white population of the Western District has already outnumbered that of the East, in the proportion of 371,570 to 369,398. And now the people of the West begin to puzzle to comprehend the rightfulness of an apportionment, which gives to the East one representative for every 4,736 white inhabitants, and to the West only 1 to every 6,635; or, in other words, makes 8 white men in Eastern Virginia equal to 11 in the West. It is to be borne in mind that the whites alone possess political power.

Well, the representatives from the West made a vigorous effort to obtain some redress or mitigation for this palpable injustice. They boldly declared, that unless they could have an equal share of favor, they would demand a division of the State by the Blue Ridge. Of course, the slaveholders were inexorable, and would concede nothing. How could they concede, when they know that, as soon as they begin to give way, the mysterious charm which sustains the slavocratic principle is gone, and gone forever? So far from getting a vote of two-thirds in favor of equality, as the constitution requires, a strong majority laid the subject on the table as totally inadmissible. The Western members then, voted down and trampled on, had no resource but in a *Protest*, and accordingly, on the last night of the session, a few moments before the final adjournment of the House of Delegates, Mr. Armstrong, of Harrison county presented the following, which was read by the clerk and laid on the table without debate, with the consent of the gentleman who presented it.

PROTEST.

"The undersigned, members of the present General Assembly of Virginia, for themselves, and on behalf of their constituents, enter and record their solemn *Protest*, against the refusal of this General Assembly to execute the authority contained in the fifth section of the constitution of this State, which prescribes that 'the General Assembly, after the year 1841, and at intervals thereafter of not less than ten years, shall have authority, two-thirds of the House concurring, to make re-appointments of delegates and Senators throughout the Commonwealth, so that the number of Delegates shall not at any time exceed 150, nor of Senators, 36.' We also *Protest* against the refusal to pass a law, providing for taking the census of the people upon calling a convention to amend the Constitution of the State.—Thus deliberately and solemnly denying, in the only two forms in which the inequality of representation throughout the State can be corrected, and refusing to the people the only means of redressing grievances violative of equal freedom, and of those sound principles unanimously affirmed by our fathers, in June, 1776, and re-affirmed by the people of Virginia in convention assembled, in January 1830.

"We, therefore, cherishing, as we do, our love of country—"THAT ALL MEN ARE BY NATURE EQUALLY FREE AND INDEPENDENT."—"That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from the People"—and believing, as we do, that all of these fundamental principles, which are embodied in our Declaration of Rights, are grossly violated by the existing apportionment of representation, avail ourselves of the only present right, that of spreading upon the Legislative journal this our *Protest*:

Signed—  
C P Derman, E J Armstrong, J J Jackson, Samuel Elliot, D Kincheloe, Philip Cox, Jr. J F Harrison, Willian Jones, V A Woodward, Charles Quillen, W H French, Jno Moler, Jas W Newkirk, Presley Martin, William G Brown, John McPherson, Jefferson T Martin, George Cowan, Allen T Caperton, Wm S Morgan, Jno McAuley, Jno M Robinson, David Pugh, Addison McLaughlin, Geo Mayes, R A Clandenin, J J Davis, Wm G Holloway, F Moore, Wright Gatewood, David Crawford, Nehemiah Smith, Timothy Taylor, Jno Grimes, Henry Erskine, A Layburn, John Carroll, J Mellen, Samuel E Goodson, H Bowen, Thomas M Tate, D M Edgington, H Hiner, Edward P Hunter, Cromwell Orrick, Jas C Shipman, E H Smith, Anthony Kennedy, D Smith, Isaac J Leftwich.

And there is still a graver question, which is, whether Congress has the power to apply a remedy, under that clause of the constitution which says that Congress shall guarantee to each state a republican Constitution. Is this distribution of political power republican? Let the spirit of '76 answer. The Supreme Court of the United States, in their late important decision concerning the surrender of fugitive slaves, have laid down the principle that where the constitution of the United States confers a right, it is also expressly forbidden, confers on Congress the power, and imposes the duty, of legislating for the enforcement of that right, nay, the exclusive right of legislation over the whole subject. But that decision was on a different subject, and was designed to restrain the other man's bull, which doubtless makes an odd, yet it will do no harm to think about the matter.

This whole case shows the short-sightedness of statesmen who would frame their policy, and build their hopes of future honor, upon the presumption of the peaceful permanence of slavery rule in Virginia.

From the *N. Y. American*.

AMERICAN SLAVES IN ALGIERS.

MR. EDITOR:—Mr. Webster's letter in relation to the Creole has led me to investigate a portion of our history, which may, perhaps, throw some light upon the principles in the present controversy.

From a report made by Mr. Jefferson, when Secretary of State, (30th Dec. 1790) and which may be found in the *American State Papers*, Vol. X. p. 59, it appears that, in 1785, the Algerines captured some of our vessels and enslaved their crews; and that our ministers then in Europe, fearing that the captives might be sold, and dispersed throughout the interior and distant countries of Africa, employed an agent to ransom them at \$200 a head. This price was refused, and Congress authorized an offer of \$550. On this, Mr. Jefferson remarked—'Within the last two or three years, the Spaniards, the Neapolitans and the Russians, had redeemed, at exorbitant prices. Slaves were became scarce, and would hardly be sold at any price.' He adds, that the Dey demanded \$2,832 a head for our countrymen; that Spain had paid \$1,200, and Russia \$1,546 a head.

In 1792, General Washington applied to the Senate to know if they would authorize him to pay 40,000 for the 13 Americans held by the Algerines, (p. 108.) They replied, that they would ratify a treaty of peace by which \$40,000 should be paid down, and an annual pay-

ment of 25,000 stipulated for the future. In

the meantime, however, the Algerines committed their depredations; and among the documents afterwards submitted to Congress by the President was a letter from a Swedish gentleman at Algiers, in which he says: "I have several times, with tears in my eyes, seen your honest countrymen sinking under the cruel yoke of Slavery." He also announced the melancholy intelligence—"The Algerine corsairs have made ten American prizes, and 105 slaves more." On the 5th of November, 1793, an American agent wrote to General Washington—'One hundred and five subjects of the United States are employed as captive slaves in the most laborious work; they are in a distressed and naked situation. A petition from these captive slaves was forwarded to Congress, in which they say—"We are employed daily at the most laborious work, without any respect of persons, with six hundred captives of other nations," (p. 337;) and a letter from one of them states that they are kept on "bread and water."

In 1795, the United States, made a treaty with Algiers, and paid \$535,500 for the liberation of these slaves.

In 1802, a Tripolitan Corsair captured the brig Franklin! with a crew of nine men, and carried her into Algiers. They Dey, although at peace with us, offered to buy the brig, cargo, and the nine slaves, of the captor; but he refused to sell, and [proceeded] with them to Tripoli.—[Am. State Papers, vol. IV.]

It seems strange to us, at the present day, to hear white men spoken of as slaves; but it should be recollect that such alone were the slaves spoken of in Scripture, in those passages which are now frequently quoted in vindication of negro slavery and also that the serfs of Russia are white as their owners.

Let us now apply to the American slaves in Barbary, the moral and legal principles applied by Mr. Webster to the negroes of the Creole. The latter we are told "are recognized as property by the Constitution of the United States;" but surely not more explicitly than our countrymen were recognized as property by the Constitution of Algiers. We have seen not only that they were liable to be sold and dispersed through the interior & distant countries of Africa," but also that they were treated much as similar property is treated at home—kept at hard work and with bad fare, and without wages. We have also seen how highly this property was valued, and what enormous prices it actually commanded.

Is certainly a supposable case that these 105 slaves might have been put on board a felucca, with a dozen Moors, to be conveyed by sea to a distant plantation; that seizing a favorable moment they might have made themselves masters of the vessel, kindly sparing the lives of all their guard, except one who had rashly discharged a musket into the very midst of them, and then madly rushed upon them with a deadly weapon. We may also suppose that our brave and humane citizens had then proceeded to Gibraltar, where they were kindly received by the officers, who permitted the Moors to take their felucca and go about their business.

The Creole negroes are, according to Mr. Webster, "Mutineers and Murderers." In whatever class of offences we may rank mutiny, *Murder* we know is a most atrocious crime against which God has denounced the heaviest penalty in this world and the next.—If, therefore, the Creole negroes are murderers, would not our countrymen have incurred the same dreadful guilt, in effecting their escape from slavery by precisely the same means?

The Creole was "carried by violence and crime against the master's will into the port of a friendly power," says the Secretary of State. Great Britain and Algiers were at peace in 1793, of course the felucca would have been carried under circumstances similar to the Creole, "into the port of a friendly power." With great confidence does Mr. Webster proceed:—"Certainly ordinary comity and hospitality entitle him (the master of the Creole) to such assistance from the authorities of the place, as should enable him to resume and prosecute his voyage and bring the offenders to justice."—On what possible ground, then, could the authorities of Gibraltar have been excused, had they refused to enable the master of the felucca to carry back to Algiers to slavery and to death one hundred and five American citizens? To this question we can imagine but one possible reply, which is, that the Americans, being prisoners of war, had a moral right to stay their enemies.

This is dangerous ground on which to rest the right of resistance on the part of slaves, for the obvious reason that nearly all the slaves ever imported into our country, were in fact prisoners of war.

True it is, they were not prisoners of war to their successive purchasers, and therefore it may be contended that a sale by the captor gives a valid title to the purchaser, and of course destroys the right of resistance on the part of the slave. Let us, then, vary our supposition a little. We have seen that the American slaves were articles of merchandise among the Barbary Powers. We will suppose these 105 slaves had been sold to the Dey of Tripoli before their escape. They would then have been no longer prisoners of war; but would have been the property of the Dey by a title as scriptural, perfect and indisputable as was that by which every negro on board the Creole was held by his master. In that case, would the guilt of murder have rested on their souls?

Would the statesmen of Europe have been justified in branding them as "mutineers and murderers?" Would the authorities at Gibraltar have been guilty of a breach of "ordinary comity and hospitality" for not surrendering them to the "justice" of their Tripolitan master?

I am inclined to believe that, with certain statesmen a man's complexion makes a wonderful difference in the application of moral and political principles.

A. B.

For the *Massachusetts Spy*.

SOUTHERN BANKS.

There has been a great excitement in Philadelphia, in relation to the Banks of the city, producing a severe run upon many of them—not for specie, for that is a commodity that none of them pay out, but for current bills of other banks.

Under the pressure, two of the Banks sunk—the Girard and the Bank of Pennsylvania!

The capital of the former was origi-

nally five millions of dollars, and is said to have been held to a great extent by widows and guardians of orphan children, the stock having been considered a peculiarly favorable one for such investments. The Philadelphia Gazette says—"Instances have already fallen under our notice, where widows and orphans have lost their all." It is publicly stated, that 9490 shares are held by females, 2663 in the hands of guardians, 4628 are held by trustees and 335 by benevolent institutions. In amount, over one million, seven hundred thousand dollars."—It is now supposed that the bills will be eventually redeemed, but that the capital stock is nearly all lost. This will occasion much suffering and distress in many families who are thus deprived of their means of support.

The Bank of Pennsylvania was the depositary of the State Government, and about \$800,000 had been deposited therein, a few days before, for the payment of the interest on the State stocks, which fell due on the first inst.—

The Bank met all its engagements, till the Governor procured an injunction to prevent its making any further payments. It is said that it had used above one half of the State deposits. This bank, also, is supposed, will pay all its liabilities except to stockholders for its capital, which is so much impaired that shares which were originally worth but \$500 now sell for about \$150. The stock of this Bank is held by a more wealthy class than that of the Girard Bank.

The Chesapeake Bank in Baltimore has had a run in consequence of which it was obliged to suspend payment. Of its probable eventual solvency or insolvency we are not informed.—We presume, however, that it is deeply insolvent, as are nearly all the suspended Banks of the South and West, if the claims of the stockholders, for the capital stock, are taken into account. Many of them have already exploded, and will never pay their circulation, and there is no doubt many more will, whenever they are required to resume payment in specie. So long as they redeem only in each others bills, which are originally worth but \$500 now sell for about \$150. The stock of this Bank is held by a more wealthy class than that of the Girard Bank.

But take the other case. An English cruiser, in quest of slaves, overhauls a vessel supposed to be a slave, but which proves to be, in reality, American. Is this, of itself, a national offence?

Why, certainly not. It depends on the circumstances of the case—whether there was good cause of suspicion; whether the act was one of wanton aggression, as done in the honest discharge of duty.

And more than this—the seizure is undoubtedly made at the peril of the party making it, and of the nation to whom it belongs. The officer would be liable in a civil action for groundless seizure, and the nation for the act of its officer. Such seizure, wantonly made, stupidly made, brutally made, or however made, if unredressed, would undoubtedly furnish the highest reason for national displeasure, and, if repeated, of war. But it can never be, that the mere fact of detaining a vessel on the ground of her being a suspected pirate, or suspected slave, can be a cause of offence to a nation, even if the supposed pirate or slave may eventually turn out to be an honest, bona fide American merchantman.

The truth is, that the South is disastrously insolvent, and their insolvency has swept away a great portion of the capital of their own banks, and also of the banks of the States and cities with which they are in the habit of commercial intercourse.

Those who trade with the South, and give them credit, may safely calculate, that, about as often as once in four or five years, they will have to lose a great portion of the debts then due them. This necessarily follows from the institutions and state of society in that section of the country. It is disreputable for a white person to labor.—Hence, one half of the whole population produces little or nothing, but are the consumers of the labor of the other portion, and larger consumers too, than they would be,

were it not for the dissolute and luxurious habits which lives of idleness engender.—It is not only disreputable to labor; but the style of living must be more extravagant than customary with those who do.

Another cause of insolvency, is, the extravagant speculation in land and slaves, which want of employment and of other means of subsistence necessarily leads to.

It was estimated that the State of Mississippi incurred an indebtedness, in one year, of more than a hundred millions of dollars, for slaves alone, and that, in a little more than a year afterwards, their value diminished nearly one half. Being constantly in debt to the North to a large amount, whenever there is a panic or a pressure, the home debts are secured as far as there is means, and the people of the North have to become the sufferers.

By this means the industry of the North is constantly taxed, to make up for the idleness of the South, and the support of the white population in that section of the country is thus divided between the slave laborers of the South & the free laborers of the North, and so it will probably continue to be, so long as the slave system prevails, and the North continues to give cred to the South as it has heretofore done.

Take another case. An American vessel is detained; the papers do not appear satisfactory, and she is carried into port, put to delay and expense, and after all, turns out a bona fide ship of the republic. Take still a third case. An American vessel is arrested by an insolent British officer, the captain is insulted, perhaps maltreated; he is compelled to stop several days to please his captor, and all this without any sufficient reason. Here, in both these last cases, the indemnity would be thought worth claiming for a case like this.

Take another case. An American vessel is detained; the papers do not appear satisfactory, and she is carried into port, put to delay and expense, and after all, turns out a bona fide ship of the republic. Take still a third case. An American vessel is arrested by an insolent British officer, the captain is insulted, perhaps maltreated; he is compelled to stop several days to please his captor, and all this without any sufficient reason.

Here, in both these last cases, the indemnity would be thought worth claiming for a case like this.

But of what kind, or to what extent? An American citizen, prosecuting a lawful commerce in the African seas, under the flag of their country, are not responsible for the abuse, or unlawful use of that flag by others; nor can they rightfully, on account of any such alleged abuses, be interrupted, molested, or detained, while on the ocean; and if thus molested and detained, while pursuing honest voyages in the usual way, and violating no law themselves, they are unquestionably entitled to indemnity.

Of course, they are entitled to indemnity—but what of what kind, or to what extent?

An American vessel is overhauled on the high seas, and compelled to show her papers. They appear satisfactory, and in an hour she is on her way again. What kind of indemnity would be thought worth claiming for a case like this?

Take another case. An American vessel is arrested by an insolent British officer, the captain is insulted, perhaps maltreated; he is compelled to stop several days to please his captor, and all this without any sufficient reason.

Here, in both these last cases, the indemnity would be thought worth claiming for a case like this.

But of what kind, or to what extent?

And how in the name of astonishment, can

## RIGHT OF SEARCH.

The following is the concluding part of a valuable article in the *New York Evening Post*, on the right of search. It is from the pen of a highly distinguished lawyer.

Now let us see how the matter stands.

The American government insists that in time of peace its vessels are not to be detained or interfered with. The British government concedes this so abundantly as to admit that if an American slave is found with slaves on board, she is to be released.

The British government insists that they have a right to detain and examine the vessels of those nations with whom they have concluded a treaty of search, (as well as their own,) whether they carry a fraudulent flag or not.

The American Minister concedes the right, "provided the interference is not extended to the vessels or citizens of the United States."

But it surely can never be that the fact of hoisting an American flag is to be a protection to any pirate or slaver that carries it. This is impossible, and our country would be the last to admit such doctrine. Suppose one of our cruisers pursues a supposed pirate in the Gulf of Mexico, or a supposed slaver on the coast of Africa, and the chase hoists English colors, would the commander of the cruiser even permit his pursuit to be arrested by any such obnoxious vessel.

But take the other case. An English cruiser, in quest of slaves, overhauls a vessel supposed to be a slave, but which proves to be, in reality, American. Is this, of itself, a national offence?

Why, certainly not. It depends on the circumstances of the case—whether there was good cause of suspicion; whether the act was one of wanton aggression, as done in the honest discharge of duty.

And more than this—the seizure is undoubtedly made at the peril of the party making it, and of the nation to whom it belongs. The officer would be liable in a civil action for groundless seizure, and the nation for the act of its officer.

Such seizure, wantonly made, stupidly made, brutally made, or however made, if unredressed, would undoubtedly furnish the highest reason for national displeasure, and, if repeated, of war.

But it can never be, that the mere fact of detaining a vessel on the ground of her being a suspected pirate, or suspected slave, can be a cause of offence to a nation, even if the supposed pirate or slave may eventually turn out to be an honest, bona fide American merchantman.

The truth is, that the South is the high road of nations. There is no division of territory to give national character. It must be established by documentary evidence. For what possible object are the papers, (the register of license with which every vessel is provided,) taken but to guard against such contingencies as these?

cessarily founded in selfishness; and such too must be the foundation of the Liberty party, if it would hope for success. The assumption is too sweeping. An individual who acts from merely selfish motives, we neither love nor trust. His path will be a downward one, for he carries within himself the most active element of self-deterioration and self-destruction.—The same is true of parties. The very reason why political parties have grown so corrupt and abominable, is because the chief element in their composition has been unmixed selfishness, sometimes of the most sordid character.

Which of the two great parties of this country looks to the interests of humanity, on a broad scale—or the influence this country is capable, when properly governed, of exerting in behalf of the cause of Liberty throughout the world? Not one. Is the first great object of either, the establishment of justice, justice to the black man, as well as the white? Far from it. The claims of justice, the security of personal rights, the true honor of their country, the interests of humanity, scarcely enter into their calculations.

God forbid that such should be the character of the Liberty party! We know that it can appeal with tremendous force to the selfish feelings of the people of the free states. It can show how slavery has encroached on their rights, impaired their political consequence, damaged their pecuniary interests; and this is all right. But, if it stop here, it will but act on the principle our fathers adopted, when they rose against the tyranny of Great Britain.—They fought to secure their own rights, while at the same time they continued their violation of the rights of the colored race. Their selfishness in this particular has entailed on their children a curse, that may yet destroy the result of all their struggles.

Shall the Liberty party pursue the same policy? Never! Its first great object should be, the establishment of justice. It should respect man, as man, irrespectively of his condition; where it has the power, secure his rights against encroachment, and, where it has no positive power, contribute all it can, by moral influence, to this end. It should regard national welfare as the consequence of national well-doing.—Nor should its views be confined to this country. Man every where should be an object of its solicitude. It should seek to place this Union in such an attitude before the world, as would promote the cause of free principles, and meliorate human suffering, in every legitimate way.

Let us then appeal to every natural principle in human nature. By all means, show the ruinous effects of slavery on the interests of the white man—but, do not forget to place our enterprise on a higher ground—the ground of equal and exact justice to all men, the recognition and treatment of man, as man, irrespective of clime, color or condition.

#### THE U. S. & GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. Webster has addressed a letter to the Governor of Massachusetts and Maine, informing them that Lord Ashburton is invested with full power to negotiate and settle the different matters in discussion between the two countries—and that, in regard to the Boundary question, he is empowered to treat for a conventional line, or line by agreement, on such terms and conditions, and with such mutual considerations and equivalents, as may be thought just and equitable. Under such circumstances, the President has thought proper to call the attention of the two states to the subject, and desire their co-operation.

The cost and delay of an additional survey of the territory in dispute, and its settlement by arbitration, are urged as reasons, for listening with favor to the proposition. The Governor of Massachusetts, it seems, is already authorized by resolutions of the Legislature, to do whatever may be necessary—and Governor Fairfield of Maine has issued a proclamation convening the Legislature of that state on the 18th inst.

Every true patriot must rejoice at the brightening prospect of preserving peace between two countries, allied by so many ties.

#### TARIFF.

The Secretary of the Treasury has transmitted to Congress, the scheme of a revised tariff, in which the duties are increased on wool, manufactured and unmanufactured, cotton, cottons, hemp, iron, leather, boots shoes &c.

The ad valorem standard is in some cases abandoned for specific duties—and where ad valorem duties are preferred, the foreign value of the articles is taken as the basis.

The Secretary estimates the expenditures of the government for the years '42 '43 and '44 at an aggregate of \$98,242,953.73. The primary object of the bill is, to raise an amount of revenue, supposed to be commensurate with the wants of the government—and a secondary object, to afford some relief to the laboring classes, and mechanical trades of the country.

A motion to refer the report to the committee of the whole on the state of the Union, failed,—which Mr. Everett considered equivalent to a declaration that there should be no tariff act before the 1st July. The report was then referred to the committee of ways and means.

#### FAVORITISM.

During the debate on the Naval Appropriation Bill, in the House of Representatives on the 13th, Mr. Everett of Vt., called the attention of members to the favoritism which had been manifested by the Administration, in the appointment of midshipmen &c. During the late Administration, he had applied for a poor orphan boy, and received some encouragement. He subsequently renewed his application, but was told the situations were all full. On the change of Administration, he applied to Mr. Badger, but was informed that a surplus of appointments had been made by the preceding Administration. From the present Secretary he had received an answer that his application

should be most respectfully considered. Since then 168 midshipmen had been appointed, but his poor orphan boy was not among the number. From the 4th of March, 1841, to the 8th of April last, the whole number appointed had been 158; of whom 31 were from Virginia, 20 from the District of Columbia, and 19 from Maryland; and of 85 other appointments, 18 had been from Virginia, 9 from the District of Columbia, and 4 from Maryland,—giving to Virginia 49, to the District of Columbia, 29, and to Maryland, 23; making 101 out of 253 appointments.

Mr. Brown alluded to the fact of his having received information from the Secretary of the Navy, that an apprentice or a sailor boy could not under the regulations of the service, be made an officer. Mr. B. protested against such a regulation as anti-republican. We think so too.

Mr. Morgan said that he had also prepared a statement.

It appeared, Mr. M. remarked, from document 173, that, according to the last census, the number of midshipmen to which Virginia was entitled, was 111—12 when 15 were appointed from that State.

New York was entitled to 21 and only 17 were appointed. There were 32 appointments of midshipmen, at large. Of this number 15 were from Virginia, 8 from Maryland, and 4 from the District of Columbia; Making 27 out of 32, from Virginia and Maryland, including the District.

Of 9 assistant surgeons, 4 were from Virginia, 2 from Maryland, and only 1 from the free States. Of 11 passengers, 3 were from Virginia and 4 from free States. Of 12 chaplains, 2 were from Virginia and 8 from free States. Of 168 midshipmen, 35 were from Virginia, 16 from Maryland, and 15 from New York; 54 were from the free States.

As regarded midshipmen, he (Mr. M.) had been placed in the same situation as the gentleman from Vermont, (Mr. Everett.) He (Mr. M.) had made application to the Secretary of the Navy under the last Administration.

He had repeated his application to the two last Secretaries, but two years he had been told that all the appointments had been filled. Yet he knew that appointments had been made for Virginia since his application made for New York. It was also that the attention of the country should be called to this variation, and that Virginia should receive no more than a fair proportion to offices—at all events, of those which belonged to the Navy.

We are glad to see this system of pro-slavery favoritism arresting the attention of members of Congress.

It would be difficult to say what special excellence there is in slaveholder's sons, to entitle them to a monopoly of such offices.

#### LETTER OF THE PRESIDENT.

Affairs in Rhode Island wear a warlike aspect. The Free Suffrage men appear determined to assert their rights by force, while on the part of the constituted authorities, no conciliatory disposition is manifested. Another letter from the President, to the Governor of Rhode Island, dated May 7th, has appeared, in which he terms the convention of Free Suffrage men, "lawless assemblies," & announces his determination to sustain by the force of the United States, the constituted authorities. He very truly says, that "changes achieved by regular and, if necessary, repeated appeals to the constituted authorities, in a country so much under the influence of public opinion, and by recourse to argument and remonstrance, are more likely to insure lasting blessings, than those accomplished by violence and bloodshed, on one day, and liable to overthrow by similar agents on another." But, we know not why the United States may not remonstrate with the charter party of Rhode Island, or constituted authorities—for it is their obstinacy, if we understand the question, that has brought about this deplorable crisis. The same clause which binds them to the constituted authorities, in a country so much under the influence of public opinion, and by recourse to argument and remonstrance, are more likely to insure lasting blessings, than those accomplished by violence and bloodshed, on one day, and liable to overthrow by similar agents on another.

But, we know not why the United States may not remonstrate with the charter party of Rhode Island, or constituted authorities—for it is their obstinacy, if we understand the question, that has brought about this deplorable crisis. The same clause which binds them to the constituted authorities, in a country so much under the influence of public opinion, and by recourse to argument and remonstrance, are more likely to insure lasting blessings, than those accomplished by violence and bloodshed, on one day, and liable to overthrow by similar agents on another.

We are not responsible for this doctrine—it is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that on which our national existence is predicated.

The consequences are of vast importance—if it be true, then, for causes similar to those which generated the Revolution, the people of this Union, or of the several States, that is, a majority or minority of the people of the Union, or of any particular state—have a right to alter or abolish, so far as they are concerned, the government under which they live. In this matter, the majority or minority is responsible to no human tribunal—it acts for itself, act on its responsibility to the God of nations.

Therefore, any state, or number of states in the Union, when the federal government becomes destructive of the inalienable rights of their citizens, has the right to throw off all allegiance to that government, and erect a new Union, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their happiness and safety."

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

In Indiana, the increase is rapid.

Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeding.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from